



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—CRITICAL NOTES ON PLATO'S LAWS, IV-VI.

PREFATORY NOTE.

The following notes on Plato's Laws, IV-VI, were prompted by my friend Mr. Conybeare's study of the Armenian version, the results of which he communicated to this Journal (XIV 335 foll.; XV 31 foll.). Mr. Conybeare, when he has completed and published the collation of the last six books of the Laws, will deal with the general question of the relative value of Gregory Magister's translation, Ficino's translation, the Paris MS and the Apographa. It was my object to try to strengthen from internal evidence his confidence in the value of the Armenian text, and in pursuing this object I have often been led to disagree with him as to details, and I have also been led to offer somewhat too many conjectures of my own. No other material but Schanz's text and Conybeare's collations has been accessible to me.

BOOK IV.

P. 98, 1 *καὶ ὁ κατοικισμὸς αὐτῆς*. This is probably right. Badham's suggestion, *κατ' οἰκισμὸν αὐτῆς*, is certainly wrong. A city may be named after local gods, rivers, wells, etc., *or* it may get its name from the circumstances of its foundation. If any change is necessary, owing to the construction, I would suggest *καινοίη ὁ κατοικισμὸς αὐτῆς*. It is highly improbable that the words *τὴν αὐτῶν φήμην* are an interpolation, as Schanz thinks.

P. 98, 10. I do not think that Ficino's rendering implies *κατ' αὐτῆς*, the reading of Arm. and Eusebius, for why should he then have added *prope*? He cannot have referred *αὐτῆς* to the city. His rendering gives the sense of the Paris MS: *κατὰ ταῦτα αὐτῆς* (*κατὰ ταῦτα* = *prope*, *αὐτῆς* = *mare illud*).

P. 99, 3 *θαλάττης, σχεδὸν ὄσον*. The divergence in the Armenian is doubtless due to a difference in punctuation, as Mr. Conybeare points out, and this punctuation is right, for *σχεδὸν* goes with *ἐγγύτερον* rather than with *εὐλιμενωτέραν*. It would be better if there were no comma at all. The received punctuation in Plato, and especially in the Laws, is often most trying to the reader.

P. 100, 32. For *ρήματα* read *εὐρήματα*.

P. 101, 19. The πόλεων καὶ δυνάμεις of the Armenian suggests that we should restore αἱ διὰ τὰ ναυτικά πολέμου νῆκαι καὶ δυνάμεις (cp. the phrase νίκη καὶ κράτος πολέμου). If νῆκαι ἀποδιδόασιν is objectionable (as I do not think it is), the text as it stands is more so.

P. 102, 29. There should be no stop after εἰσίν. Below, in line 34, should not γίγνηται be bracketed?

P. 104, 1. Here the σεισμῶν of the Armenian must be regarded as a corruption, but it rightly omits καὶ. We should read λοιμῶν τε ἐμπιπτόντων χρόνον ἐπὶ πολὺν ἐνιαυτῶν πολλῶν πολλάκις ἀκληρίαι. The last word only occurs in late Greek, but I see no reason why Plato should not have used it. I question if ἀκαιρίαι can mean 'bad harvests,' as Mr. Conybeare renders it.

P. 104, 14. Are there any other instances of this construction of συλλαβέσθαι with a dative? I should suggest here καὶ οὖρον γὰρ <καὶ> χειμῶνος συλλαβέσθαι κυβερνητικὴν ἢ μὴ.

P. 105, 1. In this passage, as given by Schanz, ὁρθῶς surely goes with τι παρὸν αὐτῷ διὰ τύχης. The Armenian, ὁρθῶσαι τὸ παρὸν αὐτοῦ διὰ τύχης τῇ τέχνῃ, can scarcely be right (but cp. L. and S., s. v. ὁρθόω), but it suggests that Plato wrote ὁρθῶς τι παρὸν αὐτοῦ διὰ τύχης τῇ τέχνῃ, and that some one who took ὁρθῶς wrongly with ἐξασθαι wrote τί, and for τῇ τέχνῃ interpolated τῆς τέχνης ἂν μόνον ἐπιδέοι. The active ἐπιδείν seems to occur nowhere else in Plato or his contemporaries, if I may trust L. and S.

P. 105, 11-13. Ficino's rendering does not seem to me to support, as Mr. Conybeare claims, the Armenian, but rather Schanz's text. I must say I should prefer to read τί μετὰ τοῦτο εἶποι ἂν ὁρθῶς ἔχειν; τὸ τοῦ νομοθέτου ἄρα φράζωμεν τοῦτο;

P. 105, 19. Surely the ψυχὴ τοιαύτη of Arm. is an interpolated reading introduced to escape from the difficulty of τῇ τυραννουμένη ψυχῇ. I suspect that τῇ τυραννουμένη was originally an adscript to δφελος εἶναι τι, and that it found its way into the text where it now stands, ψυχῇ being afterwards added. In this case we should read simply καὶ νῦν τοῦτο ξυνεπέσθω; but, of course, καὶ νῦν τῇ τοιαύτῃ ψυχῇ ξυνεπέσθω would give a good sense.

P. 107, 33. As an alternative to Mr. Conybeare's ἐπανανέωσται I would suggest ἐάν ποτε γῇ πάλιν ἐνέγκῃ φύσιν.

P. 108, 12. πῶς; certainly seems a 'nasty one' for the Athenian, and can only be vindicated by the exclusion of εἴπερ γένοιτο ὃ λέγομεν. It is probable that we should read on after μακρῷ, πειρώμεθα δέ πως.

P. 108, 27. γ' ἔτι που would perhaps be an improvement.

P. 109, 2-3. I question if *τις* can be used as Mr. Conybeare suggests. We should require *τινι*. Perhaps we should read *τισιν* = 'in some things.' *τυραννουμένη* is an interpolated reading.

P. 109, 17 we should seemingly read *τοῦ τοιούτου*, and p. 110, 11 *θειοτέρου του*.

P. 110, 12-13. The punctuation seems at fault here. Read *ποιμνίοις, καὶ ὅσων ἡμεροὶ εἰσιν ἀγέλαι οὐ κτλ.*

P. 110, 16. If we read *τοῦ γένους*, as I think we should, *τοῦ γένους ἀμεινον ἡμῶν* goes together, and we understand *γένος τὸ before τῶν δαιμόνων*.

P. 111, 2. Instead of excluding *νοσήματι*, I should for *κακῷ* write *καὶ ἀγρίῳ*.

P. 111, 15. The Armenian and Ficino prove beyond doubt that *ταύτη δεῖν* is an interpolation; but if the Armenian translator *did* read *ὃ τι ἂν* for *ἧτις ἂν*, his text was to this extent interpolated also. The passage is perfectly intelligible if we simply exclude *ταύτη δεῖν*, and Ficino renders it so. *ταύτη δεῖν* was interpolated by some one who did not understand the construction, which is perfectly normal, and = *ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ τῆς πολιτείας ἧτις ἂν ἢ καθεστηκυῖα ξυμφέρον, ὅπως κτλ.*

P. 111, 26. Perhaps it would be better to adhere to the view that the Armenian translator *never* paraphrases, but here, as elsewhere, reproduces an interpolated reading of his Greek text, i. e. *ἐαυτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς*.

P. 112, 8-9. There is nothing wrong here, as Badham suggests, but p. 82, 16 we should read *καὶ <δικαίαν> κατὰ φύσιν*. There, if *δι* had fallen out in an uncial text, as it well may have done, *καὶ ἂν* would certainly have been banished afterwards.

P. 112, 18. It would be more correct perhaps to say that *μήτε αὐτοῖς* was missing both in Ficino's text and in that of the Armenian translator.

P. 112, 30. *νόμων*, Schultheis' correction for *θεῶν*, is not likely to be right. The preceding *καὶ* shows that we require an adjective or participle opposed to *τοῖς τεθείσι*, e. g. *τῶν θετέων* or *τῶν καινῶν* (sc. *νόμων*).

P. 114, 31-115, 2 *βέλη δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἶον ἢ τοῖς βέλεσιν ἔφεςις τὰ ποῖα ἂν λεγόμενα ὀρθότατα φέροιτ' ἂν*; For *αὐτοῦ* the Arm. has *αὐτὰ*; but *αὐτοῦ* (= *τοῦ σκοποῦ*) is right, and was read by Ficino. For *ὀρθότατα φέροιτ' ἂν* we should read either *εὐθύτατα φέροιτ' ἂν* or *ὀρθότατα ἐφικνοῖτο ἂν*—probably the latter, as it cannot be said that an *ἔφεςις φέρεται*. Schanz's *φερόμενα* for *λεγόμενα* is a move in the wrong direction.

P. 115, 27-28 *τελευτησάντων δὲ κτλ.* One cannot digest the grammar of this sentence even with *τῶν εἰθισμένων ὄγκον*, and *καλλίστη* is weak after a series of imperatives (*δεῖ—χρή*). The whole long sentence from *γονέων δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα τιμαὶ ζώντων* (l. 10) to *διαφερόντως* (l. 27) is a statement of the *τιμαὶ ζώντων γονέων*. We require *καλλίστη τιμῇ* after *τελευτησάντων δὲ γονέων*, to keep us awake to this word *τιμῇ*, which is taken up again, so keenly and with direct reference to this passage, at the beginning of book V. In the present passage *τιμῇ* may have fallen out very easily between *καλλίστη* and *μήτε*, and in this loss lies the secret of the unsatisfactory grammar. The sentence perhaps stood *ταφῇ μὲν τῇ σωφρονεστάτῃ θάπτειν καλλίστη τιμῇ*, and if *τιμῇ* fell out we can understand how *ἡ σωφρονεστάτη καλλίστη* was written for *τῇ σωφρονεστάτῃ θάπτειν καλλίστη*. Below, l. 30, it is worthy of remark that the false reading *τοὺς γεννητὰς* was deliberately introduced by some one who understood *ἐτίθεσαν* as = *ἔθαπτον*, a sense which came to be almost the exclusive sense of *τίθημι* in later Greek. It may be well for me to state for the sake of clearness that I understand Schanz's text *μήτε ὑπεραίροντα—ἐτίθεσαν* as equalling *ὄγκον μέτριον*, and I do not see how it helps the grammar. Possibly it might be better to exclude *ταφῇ μὲν ἡ σωφρονεστάτῃ* (we would expect rather *ἡ μετριωτάτῃ*; cp. p. 118) as an interpolation due to the loss of *τιμῇ*, and to read *τελευτησάντων δὲ γονέων καλλίστη τιμῇ μήτε ὑπεραίροντα τὸν εἰθισμένον ὄγκον <θάπτειν> μὴτ' ἐλλείποντα ὧν οἱ προπάτορες τοῖς αὐτῶν γεννηταῖς ἐτίθεσαν*.

P. 116, 3. If the Armenian is here to be trusted, *παρεχόμενον* is either an interpolation or represents *τῶν οἰχομένων*, which a translator might have rendered by *αὐτῶν*, as we have *τῶν τέλος ἐχόντων* and *τοῖς κεκηκόσιν* just above and below.

P. 116, 4. For *τε*, banished by Ast, some particle is required, and *εἴτι* would give good sense.

P. 116, 8 *ἀ δὲ κτλ.* Cp. pp. 127-8. There can be no doubt about *πρὸς θεῶν*. Perhaps we should read *ὁμιλήματα* and exclude *ἐνυμπάντων τούτων*. Then *ὅσα* usque ad *ὁμιλήματα* would be simply a second thought for *ξένους*. In line 12 there is no lacuna. It is surely good Greek to say *ἀ δὲ πρὸς φίλους δεῖ πράττειν ὁ νόμος πείθων τοὺς πολίτας τὴν πόλιν εὐδαίμονα ἀποτελεῖ*.

P. 116, 18. Mr. Conybeare's note requires explanation. Does not *δείγμα* mean a pattern, and how could Ficino have rendered it otherwise than by 'exemplum'? For *διεξελλθόντα*, in line 20, I would rather read *διασαφήςαντα*, or some similar word.

P. 116, 30-117, 2. The omission of *εἰς τὸ* by the Armenian may help to restore the context here. One can get no sequence

out of the passage as it stands in Schanz. The sense required is as follows: τὰ τοῖνυν δὴ λεχθέντα ἔδοξέν τί μοι προύργον δρᾶν αὐτῷ. περὶ ὧν γὰρ ἂν παραινῇ μὴ παντάπασιν ὁμαῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμερώτερον φαίη ἂν ἀκούειν τὴν εὐμενεστέραν. This is, of course, only *verbi gratia*, and a paraphrase in English will be more instructive. "What precedes is of some service to the νομοθέτης in making the citizens εὐπειθέστεροι; for in order that the citizens may be εὐπειθεῖς, they must be well disposed to the νομοθέτης; so that (ὥστε κτλ., l. 2) if he has made them better disposed towards him by what precedes, he has gained a great advantage." In p. 117, l. 3 I would read ἀπείργασται. In the text as it stands ὅπερ φησὶν (φημί Vermehren) has no point. Plato then goes on to demonstrate that as the doctor will have more chance of making his patient adopt his treatment and be cured, if he first makes him his friend (p. 119, 24) by taking him into his confidence and showing him something of his theory; so the lawgiver will not be able to tame the citizens to listen to and obey his laws unless he makes them well disposed by expounding his theory. Cp. p. 122, 23.

P. 118, 13. αὐτὴν is, according to Schanz, the reading of the Paris MS. As Mr. Conybeare says, it is absurd to suspect ἐν τῇ ποιήματι, which responds to ἐν τῷ νόμῳ (l. 7). To take διακελεύοιτο as passive does not, I think, improve matters. αὐτὴν is necessary. After αὐ I should insert εἰ, i. e. φειδωλὸς δ' αὐ εἴ τις καὶ πένης ἀνὴρ (sc. θάπτειν αὐτὸν διακελεύοιτο) τὸν καταδεῖα (ἂν ἐπαίνοιη).

P. 118, 26, 27 ἢ καθάπερ ἱατρός τις? and line 29 ἐκατέρων?

P. 119, 6. δὲ must be wrong; perhaps οὔδε.

P. 120, 2. We should probably cut out the περί after πόλεων, reading κ. φ. τὴν περὶ γεν. ἀρχὴν πόλεων πρώτην κ. τ. τ. This position of πρώτην, given by the Arm., is certainly the right one.

P. 121, 6. I do not see why τῷ μήκει τὸ σμικρότατον should be banished. The sense is 'double in length at the least.'

Surely from καλῶς (18) to βία (line 30) belongs to Clíniās (cp. ὑπὸ τοῦδε (fort. ὑπὸ σου?), p. 122, 22). καλῶς ὦ Μ. λέγεις is quite inadequate as an answer to Megillus.

BOOK V.

P. 124, 15. ὁρθῶς should be excluded. The substitution of ψυχῇ for τιμῇ in the next line vindicates the grammar at the expense of the sense. If the Armenian represents θεῖον γὰρ τι (sc. ἡ ψυχῇ) ἢ τίμιον, it may suggest something, e. g. θεῖον γὰρ ἀγαθὸν τὸ τίμιον. Anyhow, τίμιον is probably right, and by this means we

may be⁷⁷ enabled to get rid of the difficulty about αὐτὴν below, which grammatically means τὴν τιμὴν.

P. 126, 4. It would be difficult for a translator to avoid expressing *ab eis* before ἀποσχίζεσθαι, even if he did not find it in his text. It would require stronger evidence to compel us to adopt a reading on the face of it so unidiomatic as Stobaeus' τῶν μὲν.

P. 129, 8. If we read ἐκτῆσθαι δύναται, then μὴ μόνον αὐτὸν ἔχειν κτλ. must be explanatory of ἔπαινον, or rather of the imperative or protreptic sense implicit in the ἔπαινος of the lawgiver. Is this, however, possible? The words cannot depend on χρή, as this dislocates the sentence at καὶ ὅσα. The μὴ δυνάμενον, two lines below, is also against the Armenian Version. I should suggest ἔκτεται, <τὰ> δυνατὰ μὴ μόνον αὐτὸν ἔχειν <δεῖν> ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλοις μεταδιδόναι. Here, of course, τὰ δυνατὰ = τὰ δυνατὰ ἄλλοις μεταδιδόναι.

P. 131, 3-12. Following in this passage the Armenian, which, obviously, is from an uninterpolated text, I should write the whole as follows: παραγγέλλειν δὲ παντὶ πάντ' ἄνδρα καὶ ὄλην <πόλιν> (ita Badham) περιχάρειαν πᾶσαν ἀποκρυπτόμενον καὶ περιωδυνίαν εὐσχημονεῖν πειρᾶσθαι, κατὰ τε εὐπραγίας ἱσταμένου τοῦ δαίμονος ἐκάστῳ καὶ κατ' ἀτυχίας, οἷον πρὸς ὕψηλα καὶ ἀνάντη ἀνθιστάμενον τισὶν <ἐν> παρατάξει· ἐλπίζειν δ' αἰεὶ τοῖς γ' ἀγαθοῖσι τὸν θεὸν <ὁμοι> α δωρεῖσθαι καὶ πόνων μὲν ἐμπιπτόντων ἀντὶ μειζόνων ἐλάττους ποιήσιν, τῶν τ' αὖ νῦν παρόντων ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον μεταβολὰς, τὰ <δὲ> ἐναντία (i. e. τὰ ἡδέα καὶ τὰ βελτίονα) τούτων αἰεὶ πάντων (i. e. τῶν πόνων καὶ τῶν παρόντων ἀτυχημάτων) περιγενήσεσθαι μετ' ἀγαθῆς τύχης. ὅλως cannot stand where Mr. Conybeare puts it.

P. 131, 7. I replace ἀνθιστάμενον. The sense I understand is: "Every single citizen and the city as a whole should bid each man carry himself nobly, suppressing his feelings of exultation or dejection, whether his luck be good or ill, as if he were standing in the ranks and facing enemies who held a steep hill."

P. 132, 2. παρὰ φύσιν is an interpolation.

P. 132, 12. If the Armenian is right in omitting πρὸς, we should read βουλήσεων, but its position seems awkward. However, it improves the sense.

P. 132, 19-26. I cannot understand exactly from Schanz how Badham dealt with this passage. I should suggest ἐν ᾧ δ' αὖ βίῳ ἰσορροπεῖ καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς πρόσθεν δεῖ ἰδίᾳ νομίζεσθαι, τῶν ἀνισορρόπων βίῳ ὡς τῶν μὲν ὑπερβάλλοντα τῷ φίλῳ ἡμῖν [βουλόμεθα] τῶν δ' αὖ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς [οὐ βουλόμεθα]· πάντας δὲ (ita Badham) τοὺς βίους ἡμῶν ὡς

ἐν τοῖτοις ἐνδεδεμένοι πεφύκασιν [καὶ] δεῖ διανοεῖσθαι, ὅπόσους (ita Badham) φύσει βουλόμεθα.

P. 132, 27. Perhaps *τίνες* δὴ καὶ πόσοι εἰσὶ βίοι, ὥνπερ δεῖ προελόμενον <ἐνα>, τὸ βουλῆτόν τε καὶ ἐκούσιον ἀβούλητόν τε καὶ ἀκούσιον εἰδῶτα (vel κατιδόντα) καὶ εἰς νόμον ἑαυτῷ ταξάμενον, τὸν φίλον ἄμα καὶ ἡδὺν κτλ. Cp. p. 155, 2 ff.

P. 133, 25. We should probably read εἰ δὴ ὁ σῶφρων τοῦ ἀκολάστου (sc. ἔχει ἐλάττονα ἀμφοτέρα καὶ ὑπερβάλλει τῇ ἡδονῇ). The looseness of this whole passage is owing to the fact that the *ὑγιεινὸς βίος* was introduced as an after-thought. The only alternative is to exclude ὁ δὴ σῶφρων τοῦ ἀκ., with Cornarius; but it is difficult to see why it should have been interpolated.

P. 134, 12. ἐν τοῖς τρόποις is right. It means 'in their behavior,' and is not a technical word. Ast's ἐν ταῖς στροφαῖς is out of the question. βεβαιότητα ἐν τοῖς τρόποις corresponds to ἐπιεικεία τινὶ δικαίᾳ, and if στροφαὶ means 'the turns of the shuttle,' what is the point of saying that the upright threads (στήμονες) are βέβαιαι ἐν ταῖς στροφαῖς. The point of the contrast is that they are *fixed*. The similitude of warp and woof suggests itself to Plato as regards laws and the administration of laws. The context is very difficult to follow as the passage stands in Schanz, for we are led to suppose that Plato had transferred his similitude of the warp and woof to the μεγάλαι ἀρχαὶ and σμικραὶ—a quite unjustifiable transition in thought, and indeed impossible. Cp. p. 159. The evidence of the texts, however (Stobaeus and the Paris MS), tends to show that from ὅθεν (l. 13) onwards the passage originally stood thus: ὅθεν δὴ τοὺς τὰς ἀρχὰς ἐν ταῖς πύλεσιν ἄρξοντας δεῖ διακρίνεσθαι τινα τρόπον ταύτη καὶ τοὺς <μεγάλας καὶ τοὺς> σμικρὰς κτλ. The loss of μεγάλας καὶ τοὺς would certainly have caused σμικρὰς to be changed to σμικρᾶ. We must regard the σμικρᾶ of the Paris MS as an error of its copyist, since its μεγάλας for τὰς is an interpolation prompted by σμικρὰς. ὅθεν hangs on to ἐπιεικεία δικαία. Has the Armenian μεγάλας or τὰς? This should have been noted.

P. 135, 20 τούτους ὡς νόσημά τι πόλεως ἐμπεφυκός, τῇ ἀπαλλαγῇ δι' εὐφημίας ὄνομα κτλ.?

P. 136, 12-14 ἥς δεῖ . . . ὑπάρχειν? and below, in line 16, the Armenian δεομένους suggests δαιομένους, on which νεμομένους may be a gloss; but no exception can be taken to νεμομένους. Cp. p. 140, 13; 142, 3.

P. 137, 18-23 γῆς μὲν κτλ. This sentence is very unsatisfactory as it stands in Schanz, as the opposition of γῆς μὲν and πλῆθους δέ

is disturbing to the logic. I should suggest γῇ μὲν ὁπόση . . . προσδεῖ πλήθους, ὁπόσοι <δ' αὖ> τοὺς προσχώρους κτλ.

P. 137, 25. For ἵνα περαίνηται I should suggest διαπερανθήτω, καὶ.

P. 138, 4. The omission of πᾶς by the Armenian perhaps implies that we should read οὐ μὲν δὴ οὐδ' εἰς εἰς πάντα, which would be more sensible.

P. 138, 19, 20. The first πείσαντες, rightly excluded by Hermann, probably represents a marginal correction, πεισθέντες. πεισθέντες δὲ θυσίας κτλ. is certainly required, as the subject of what follows is τινες, not λόγοι.

P. 139, 11 δευτέρως ἂν. Unless Badham's correction is accepted, it is absolutely necessary to write δευτέρως ἂν <ὡδε>.

P. 140, 8. There can be little doubt but that the Armenian is interpolated here, but its interpolations point to an old dislocation of the passage. I should suggest ἦν δὲ νῦν ἡμεῖς ἐπικεχειρήκαμεν, ἡ τιμῇ | δευτέρα οὐσα, εἴη γε ἂν, γενομένη πως, ἀθανασίας ἐγγύτατα, τρίτην δὲ κτλ. From ἡ τιμῇ δευτέρα οὐσα the Armenian makes ἡ τε μία καὶ ἡ δευτέρα εἶρηται; from the same words the Paris MS makes καὶ ἡ μία δευτέρως. As the words are differently placed in the two sources, we must suppose that in their common source they were written in the margin in a corrupt form, e. g. ἡ τε μία δευτέρως with an additional marginal conjecture of καὶ ἡ for ἡ τε. This καὶ ἡ was substituted for ἡ τε in the Paris text and inserted after μία in the Armenian, thus causing the interpolations of the latter. Among these I reckon the transposition of τρίτην δὲ κτλ. It is perhaps improper to form such elaborate hypotheses in matters of textual criticism, but they may at least suggest something simpler and better, but beyond my wits.

P. 140, 19 ff. We should read τῷ καὶ δέσποιναν καὶ θεόν. The first καὶ at least, omitted by the Armenian, is urgently required. Mr. C.'s νομίζεσθαι is admirable in the sense of 'is supposed to be the property of,' but some word nearer to γεγόναι is required. If one had only γεγόναι to deal with, I should suggest θνητὸν ὄντα γεωργεῖν. The Armenian clearly shows that ταῦτα δ' ἔχειν διανοήματα is an interpolation, and a plausible compromise would be to read θνητὸν ὄντα γεωργεῖν καὶ νομίζειν τὰ περὶ κτλ. The passage from πατρίδος onwards would then be thus rendered: "And as the land is his fatherland, he must cherish it more than children cherish their mother, because he is a mortal, and the land which he tills is a goddess and his mistress, and to the gods and demons who dwell in it he pays divine honors." The goddess

Ge (= χώρα) is distinguished from the ἐγχώριοι θεοὶ. The remedy of this passage depends upon one's grasping this. Both together make the πάντες θεοὶ of p. 142, 9.

P. 140, 29 ὃν ἂν αὐτῷ μάλιστα ἔχη φίλον?

P. 140, 30 καὶ θεραπευτὴν θεῶν καὶ γένους καὶ πόλεως. The Armenian and Ficino transfer καὶ πόλεως, and it is intolerable where it stands in Schanz's text. I should regard καὶ πόλεως as a marginal suggestion in the archetype due to a καὶ twice written, i. e. θεῶν καὶ καὶ γένους. Certainly we are better without it.

P. 141, 15. Schanz's ἀπαντας is surely wrong. It is better to suppose a lacuna after νουθητήσεσι, e. g. <καὶ παιδία> πρεσβυτῶν περὶ νέους διὰ λόγων νουθητικῶν ἀπαντῶσαι δύνανται κτλ.

P. 141, 23. The Armenian seems to be derived from κύμα μετὰ κατακλυσμοῦ φέρον νόσους ἢ πολέμων φθοράς, which is possible. Certainly there is an awkwardness about the Paris reading, and φθοράς would be an improvement for φθορά. It is a matter of taste how we restore the passage.

P. 141, 25 παρεμβάλλειν. This is, of course, the official word, but there is no reason why Plato should not have written ὑπεμβάλλειν here. The ἐμβολή is an alternative to the ἐκπομπή, and ὑπεκπέμπειν at least is a familiar word.

P. 143, 1 πᾶσιν ὁπόσοις ἔνδεια οἰκετῶν?

P. 143, 33. The Armenian seems to point to τὰ δὲ μὴ δυνατὰ καὶ εἰ βούλοιτο ματαίαις βουλήσεσιν οὐκ ἂν ἐπιχειροῖ. If καὶ εἰ were added in the margin of the original MS, it may have been in the one case lost, in the other misplaced and corrupted to καὶ ἐν. Its omission in the one case would account for the reconstruction of the sentence with οὗτ' ἂν—οὗτ' ἂν.

P. 144, 17. Read, following the Armenian, ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἀγαθὸς ὅταν ᾗ φειδωλός, <ὅταν δὲ μὴ φειδωλὸς> τότε ποτὲ καὶ πάγκακος. ἀγαθὸς δὲ κτλ.

P. 145, 31 ff. We should possibly write ἐν ἀρχαῖς τε καὶ εἰσφοραῖς καὶ διανομαῖς τὴν τῆς ἀξίας ἑκαστοῦ τιμὴν, excluding τὰς τιμὰς τε καὶ ἀρχὰς (p. 146, 3).

P. 147, 21 τῇ τῆς ἀλλῆς οὐσίας κτήσσει ἴσα?

P. 148, 11. The correction χρὴ δ' ἐπαναλαμβάνειν seems almost certain.

P. 149, 33. For οὐκ εἰσὶν we should probably write φύσει εἰσὶν or φύσεσιν εἰσὶν.

P. 150, 4. Plato probably wrote δι' αὐτὴν τὴν γῆν τροφήν ἀναδιδούσαν. The loss of γῆν would have caused the insertion of ἐκ τῆς γῆς.

BOOK VI.

As Mr. C. says, by some chance the Armenian is here of less apparent value.

P. 151, 1 ff. I should write *ἔργου, τῷ πόλιν εὖ παρεσκευασμένῳ* (ita Badham), *ἀρχὰς ἀνεπιτηδείους <εἰ> ἐπιστήσαι* (ita Ast). It is possible, but unlikely, that the words the Armenian omits (*τοῖς—πλέον*) are an interpolation. If so, we must read *ἐπιστήσαι, <τῶν> εὖ τεθέντων οὐχ ὅτι γέλως κτλ.*, and suppose that the interpolation was caused by the false reading *παρεσκευασμένην* on the one hand, and by the loss of *τῶν* on the other.

P. 155, 31. Here, following the Armenian and Hermann, we should write *ὅπόσ' ἂν τις πλέον ὑπερβάς ἐβδομήκοντα ζῆ, μηκέτι ἐν τούτοις τοῖς ἔτεσι τοῖς ἄρχουσι τὴν τηλικαύτην ἀρχὴν ὡς συνάρξων διανοηθῆτω*.

P. 158, 26. I should write *ἐκάστοτε* for *ἐκατέρους* (cp. p. 147, 15). Then it is not necessary to suppose a lacuna. Cp. p. 159, 2.

P. 160, 24. I cannot see the difficulty in *οἷς μὴ καθεστήκοι*. We must construe *τοῖς θεοῖς, οἷς*.

P. 161, 12. We should possibly write *τρίς δὲ τρεῖς*, which would make the process clearer. The genuine text in this case is *τρίς δὲ* with *τρεῖς* added in the margin. Into the Armenian text, the Paris text and Stobaeus *τρεῖς* was wrongly introduced as a correction of *τρίς* in line 11. It was also substituted for *τρίς* in line 12 by the Paris text and Stobaeus. The Armenian avoided this last error.

P. 163, 3. Possibly *ποτίζουσαι* for *ποιούσαι*. The difficulty below lies in the conjunctives *ποιῶσιν, κοσμῶσι*, which depend on nothing, as they cannot possibly depend on *ὅπως ἂν* (l. 1). We want *ποιεῖτωσαν, κοσμεῖτωσαν*. The sentence is much helped by the insertion of *ἦ* between *ῥας* and *εἰ* (l. 9).

P. 164, 24-27 *μὴ ἐπεξιῶν <δὲ> ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐνεχέσθω [νόμοις] καὶ πλείονι τῶν ν. ζ. <πρὸς τῷ> περὶ τὰς τῶν νέων ἀρχὰς ἡτιμῶσθαι?*

P. 166, 1 *δυνατοὺς [τε] εἶναι [καὶ] σχολάζοντας*.

P. 166, 5. Perhaps *λῆξιν* is more likely to have fallen out here than *κρίσιν*; but cp. p. 167, 29, where, however, I should be inclined to substitute *λῆξιν* for *κρίσιν*.

P. 166, 11. Perhaps *δέκα τῶν πρώτων χειροτονηθέντων*.

P. 167, 2 *ἀσκήσεων*. The MS has *οἰκήσεων*. I have no doubt but that Plato wrote *οἰκουρήσεων*.

P. 167, 5. *ἀγωνίαν* is scarcely possible. Read *τὰ γυμνικά*.

P. 167, 13. For *γιγνομένη μουσικῇ* read *γιγνομένην μουσικῆς. μουσικῆς* goes with *τοὺς ἄρχοντας*.

P. 167, 17 *εἰσαγωγεύς τε εἶναι—ἀποδιδοὺς*. This I do not under-

stand. I should write *εἰσαγωγεύς γε εἶναι τοῖς ἀμιλλωμένοις τὴν διάκρισιν εἰς ἄλλους ἀποδιδούς*. Cp. line 30 *εἰς τοὺς κριτὰς—τὴν κρίσιν*, words for the exclusion of which I see no reason.

P. 168, 19. For *ἡμερον* one should surely read *ἀνήμερον*.

P. 168, 27. I doubt *ἐπιμεληθῆναι*, as *κατὰ δύναμιν ὅτι μάλιστα* goes with *καθιστάντα* and refers to the efforts of the *νομοθέτης* to find the best man. If the Armenian translator *really* renders *καὶ ἀρεστὸν εἶναι* for *αἰρεθῆναι*, this suggests the substitution for *καλῶς αἰρεθῆναι* of *λῶστα καὶ ἄριστα*. I understand *τὸν μέλλοντα* as the object of *καθιστάντα*. The *νομοθέτης* is, of course, the subject of *ἄρξασθαι*. Cp. p. 170, 13.

P. 171, 19. *νομοθέτησις* should certainly be written for *νόμων θέσις*. I cannot understand the conjecture *ἡδ' ὅλων* for the Armenian *ἡδονῶν*. In lines 20–21 the Paris reading seems to me to be right. If we read *ταῦτα—εἰρησθαι*, we should want *περιμενέτω*. Plato is very reserved in this passage.

P. 173, 28 ff. I should prefer to exclude *ἔχων* in line 30 and *σπουδή* in line 34. In line 36 there should be no comma after *πόλεως*, and *ἡ* (p. 174, line 1) should be retained. *πόλεως ἀνάστατον γίγνεσθαι* and *λείπειν φυγὴν τὴν πόλιν* are two different things.

P. 179, 9 ff. *καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοις* (l. 11) is certainly wrong. We should begin a new sentence with *ἅμα δὲ* (l. 9); the words *σχεδὸν—θεοῦ* are a parenthesis. Then for *καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοις* read *πρὸς τοῦτο*. The Armenian may have had *καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο*.

P. 179, 26. The Armenian seems to point to *θεὸς ὥς* as the right reading.

P. 179, 29 ὅον <*νεοττίαν εἰς*> *νεοττῶν ἐγγέννησιν κτλ.*?

P. 181, 16 ff. *δῆλον ὥς ἐπειδὴ δύσκολόν ἐστι τὸ θρέμμα ἄνθρωπος πρὸς τὸ ἐθέλειν εἶναι τε καὶ γίγνεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἀναγκαίαν διόρισιν, τὸ δοῦλόν τε ἔργῳ διορίζεσθαι καὶ ἐλεύθερον καὶ δεσπότην οὐδαμῶς εὐχέρης*. On this supposition the Armenian *τὸ εἰθίσθαι* is an interpolation which took the place of the transposed words.

P. 182, 3 *πλέον δὲ αὐτὸν προτιμῶντα· ὁρθὴ δὲ τροφή κτλ.*?

P. 183, 8. I cannot understand how *ιδρύματα* is to be construed. Possibly <*θεωροῦντες*> *θεῶν ιδρύματα*. The other law-courts are to be *next* the temples; *in* the temples (*ἐν τοῦτοις*) are to be the courts which try for murder and other capital offences.

P. 183, 16. For *ἐκπέμπειν* I should write *εἰ ἐκπέμπουμεν*.

P. 185, 10. The Paris MS seems here to derive from a text which had *πολλῆς ἀνθρώποις ἀπορίας*.

P. 188, 31. It is more probable that *οἱ* dropped out before *ἡνίκα* than that *εἰς* dropped out after *ἀφικόμεθα*.